



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The book represents the labors of the author's leisure hours when at rest from his sterner work in history ; it is to be hoped that several volumes more, of a similar character and treatment, will be forthcoming from the same source of mediæval fiction which gives freshness and youth, renewed from of old, to this his first endeavor to recall the past romances and their imaginative beauty.

F. L. CRITCHLOW.

*Princeton University.*

### ROMANCE SYNTAX.

*Zur Entwicklung der Romanischen Wortstellung aus der Lateinischen*, von ELISE RICHTER, Dr. Phil. Halle a. S. : Verlag von Max Niemeyer, 1903.

Very little work has hitherto been done on the development of the Romance word-position out of the Latin, hence any work relative to this subject will be of interest to Romance scholars. In the present treatise the question is considered from a psychological standpoint and the theory is advanced that the change from the Latin word-position, in which the verb is regularly at the end of the sentence, to the Romance word-position, in which the verb has been advanced toward the beginning of the sentence, is due to a tendency to advance the psychologically less important in order to prepare the way for and add emphasis to the psychologically more important. The verb is a psychologically unimportant member of the sentence, hence its transposition toward the beginning.

It will be of interest to note the method that Dr. Richter has employed in advancing such a theory, and therefore I shall give a brief outline of the treatise.

The argument is preceded by a summary of the contents, which affords a very good idea of the nature of the treatise, and is followed by a bibliography of some five hundred works, most of which, however, are publications of the texts from which Dr. Richter has drawn the numerous illustrative examples. These constitute considerably more than one-half of the one hundred and fifty-seven pages devoted to the argument. The latter

is divided into five chapters, which are entitled respectively :

1. Latin Positions in Romance.
2. Psychological Reason for the Change.
3. Romance Positions in Latin.
4. The Chief Accent of various Categories of Words and Positions in the Sentence.
5. Close and Loose Syntactical Combinations. Inversion.

The first three of these chapters constitute the logical development of the subject, whereas the fourth and the fifth are valuable rather because of the discussion of certain doubtful Romance constructions than because they materially aid in the development of the theory.

In the first chapter, before a consideration of the subject proper, namely, The Latin positions that have passed into Romance, Dr. Richter calls attention to those complicated Latin constructions that have not been preserved in the Romance Languages ; their absence from the latter is attributed to the fact that because of their artificiality and complexity they were not used by the folk, and hence could not survive. Dr. Richter next calls attention to the fact that the Romance order existed in Latin side by side with the normal Latin order, the only difference being that the Latin order was the older, and hence was not easily displaced.

It is only at this point that Dr. Richter defines the terms : *Latin word-order* and *Romance word-order*. In the normal Latin sentence the word-order is : Subject—Object—Remainder—Verb ; in the normal Romance sentence the order is : Subject—Verb—Object—Remainder. Thus the essential difference lies in the position of the verb, and the explanation of the shift of the verb from the last to the second place is the object of Dr. Richter's treatise.

The Greek passes through a period of development exactly similar to that of the Latin-Romance, with which it exactly agrees in date, but Dr. Richter thinks that the two are parallel developments, and that the Latin could not have been caused by the contemporary Greek development.

Having now differentiated the Latin and Romance orders, Dr. Richter returns to the subject announced at the beginning of the chapter and

cites numerous examples from all the Romance languages to show that the Latin positions may still be found in the Romance languages in the following cases: (1) Adverb before Verb, (2) Object before Verb, (3) Predicate before Verb, (4) Verbum infinitum before Verbum finitum. The examples here cited are quite interesting and afford an explanation of many French idioms, such as: *à tout faire, si ferai-je*, etc., etc. To these four types may be added a fifth: the final position of the verb, which is often to be found, especially in the older period. The final position of the verb is especially frequent in subordinate clauses, and this is attributed by Dr. Richter to the fact that the subordinate clause is by its very nature brought into less prominence, and is less strongly accented than the leading clause, hence an obsolescent construction would here survive longer than in the leading clause. It is here that we have one of the greatest differences between German and Romance word-order, for, while in German the subordinate clause is developed in conscious differentiation from the leading clause, in Romance there is rather a tendency to strive for uniformity.

Dr. Richter has investigated the cases where the verb is to be found at the end of the clause and differentiates as follows:

I. Subordinate Clauses with Subject at Beginning.

A. Relative Subject Clauses.

B. All Subordinate Clauses with Pure Conjunctions.

II. Subordinate Clauses with Final Position of the Verb due to an introduction through:

A. Relative Object or Relative Adverbial Expression.

B. Adverbial Conjunction.

In the fourth chapter Dr. Richter offers an explanation for the final position of the verb in the second and not in the first of these divisions.

The second chapter gives the psychological reason for the change from Latin to Romance word-order, thus furnishing the keynote of the discussion, and it is here that the weakness of the argument may be seen.

Thurneysen advanced the theory for the French that the position of the verb in the second place is on rhythmical grounds and that the verb is to be

regarded as an enclitic after a strongly accented subject. But Dr. Richter is opposed to this view, as well as to the view that the accentuation of the sentence constitutes a steadily descending series, and cites many examples to show that the subject, when standing first, usually serves as a connecting link between what has preceded and what is to follow and is not necessarily the most important member. In fact, neither subject nor verb is usually the most important member of the sentence, but that member which contains the Dominating Idea is the most important, this is usually postpositive and is rarely either subject or verb. That the subject is not always strongly accented may be seen from the fact that it is often omitted, allowing the verb to stand in the first place, and, as Dr. Richter has shown by numerous examples, the verb though standing thus in the first place, is not the most emphatic member of the sentence. It stands there merely because the superfluous subject has been omitted, not because the verb is to be brought into greater prominence, but because there is nothing to stand before it.

Turning now to the imperative sentence, Dr. Richter shows that the same laws underlie this manner of expression that underlie the proposition. In the older times the imperative, or the subjunctive used as the imperative, would stand at the close of the sentence, just as occurred in the proposition, but gradually the verb passed to the beginning and not because it was the most emphatic member, as is shown by its frequent omission; rather do we have a tendency to advance the psychologically less important member toward the beginning of the sentence and to push the psychologically more important toward the close. In illustration, Dr. Richter cites the old Sanskrit introduction: "There was once upon a time," also the introduction by the speaker of a word of saying or thinking, a word that is not in itself important, but merely prepares the way for the important member. Thus, concludes Dr. Richter, the sentence is not constructed on rhythmical grounds, but it is constructed with a view to so placing the psychologically important member that it will produce the proper effect. In other words, the change from the Latin word-order of Subject—Object—Remainder—Verb to the Romance order of Subject—Verb—Object—Remain-

der is based upon psychological grounds where rhythm is of little importance. It is the result of a striving to advance the psychologically unimportant toward the beginning of the sentence in order to prepare the way for and thus add emphasis to the psychologically important.

In this chapter, which gives, as it were, the essence of the discussion, Dr. Richter seems to occupy the position of one who, having a certain theory to overthrow (the rhythmical), devotes all his energy to this end, then, having accomplished this, in his eagerness to establish another, pet theory, fails to note that the latter may be as improbable as the former. I shall reserve further criticism until I have given an outline of the remaining three chapters.

In the third chapter Dr. Richter investigates the Romance positions that already existed in the Latin, that is we have here a complement of the discussion of the first chapter. The discussion of the subject proper is prefaced by an explanation of the difference between Latin and Romance sentence-accentuation. The Dominating Idea, says Dr. Richter, bears the chief accent in the sentence; in Latin the subject is at the beginning and the verb is at the end, thus, as the Dominating Idea is rarely found in either subject or verb, the chief accent of the Latin sentence falls upon the middle. In Romance, however, the verb has been removed from the end of the sentence toward the beginning and thus here in Romance the chief accent usually falls at the close of the sentence. Dr. Richter now considers the examples of the removal of the verb toward the beginning of the sentence in Latin and shows that numerous examples of this Romance word-position are to be found in the Latin. Examples are cited where the finite verb comes before the predicate or before the infinitive and in these examples the finite verb is neither weakened nor strengthened by its change of position, nor is the qualifying expression changed in value. Why, then, did the ancients use extremely complicated constructions? Was this (as has often been claimed) due to a feeling for rhythm? In reply to these questions, Dr. Richter would say that these complicated phrases are due rather to a fondness for peculiarly turned constructions. Such authors as Cicero could have expressed themselves both simply and rhythmically

had they so desired, but they often intentionally chose the more complicated form. Then, too, the more affected the style of the author the more may we note an inclination toward these complex constructions, which passed out of use since they answered to no psychological law, whereas the Romance constructions remained because they did answer to such a law.

These three chapters constitute the body of Dr. Richter's argument. In them a theory has been overthrown, but I cannot see that another has been established.

The remaining two chapters may be regarded as necessary additions, their value lies rather in the investigation of certain individual constructions than in the advancement of the theory.

The fourth chapter, where the accentuation of various members of the sentence is discussed, may be regarded as consisting of three parts: In the first part Dr. Richter investigates the cases in which the first word of the sentence may bear the strongest accent; in the second the accent of the second word is investigated; the third part is a consideration of the question of proclitics at the beginning of the sentence, which leads to a discussion of the relative position of auxiliary and participle. This will be better understood if I call attention to the more interesting features of the chapter.

In the first part Dr. Richter finds that the first word bears the chief accent in learned definitions and in questions that can not be answered by a mere particle of affirmation or negation; for example, in such a question as *quis eum vidit?* *quis* bears the chief accent. Here the first word is usually the subject. Again the first word often bears the accent in narrations, orders, descriptions, and here the first word is rarely the subject. It is under this head that an interesting theory is advanced. Dr. Richter shows by the aid of numerous examples that in the oldest type of the interrogative sentence the interrogative word does not stand in the first place, but stands in the position that would be occupied by the word to which it refers. For example, the oldest type of the interrogative sentence would be: *Aeschines ubi est?* where the interrogative word *ubi* stands in the position that would be occupied by the word to which it refers. For example, *Aeschines*

*ubi est?* would correspond to: *Aeschines Athenis est*. Now, says Dr. Richter, this position is akin to the position of the relative in the middle of the clause, as for example, in: *otio qui nescit uti*; and it is out of this latter position that the Spanish construction, *que es* = present, and *que fué* = former, grew. From this construction of the relative in the middle of the clause is also developed the construction of participial predicate + relative + finite verb, which comes to mean "as soon as." For example, *Venu que fut*. Another derivation is seen in the popular form: *Ivrogne que tu es!* In those interrogative sentences that may be answered by a mere particle of affirmation or negation the Dominating Idea, and hence the chief accent, lies not in a single word of the interrogative sentence, but rather in the logical affirmation or denial of the whole.

As has been noted the second part of the chapter is devoted to a consideration of the accent of the second word in the sentence. Is it possible, Dr. Richter asks, that the verb in the second place may be regarded as an enclitic hung on to the subject? This is answered negatively, for the verb itself serves as a support for the enclitic pronoun, and therefore cannot itself be so devoid of accent as to become an enclitic in its own turn. It has already been shown that the verb has not the strongest accent, neither has it the weakest. It has a medium accent, an argument already advanced.

In the third part of the chapter Dr. Richter shows once more that the first member of the sentence is not necessarily the most strongly accented, for proclitics (for example, the auxiliaries) may open the sentence. On the other hand, the auxiliary is often placed after the verbum infinitum and it is from this postpositive position of the auxiliary that the Romance future was developed.

It will be noticed that the second and third sections of this chapter offer much useless repetition of matter already advanced in the second chapter.

In the fifth and last chapter, on close and loose syntactical combinations and inversions, Dr. Richter finds that adverb and verb are more closely connected than the other members of the sentence, and that subject and verb furnish the loosest combination. For this reason the subject does not stand between adverb and verb. When, in the

combination: Subject—Verb—Remainder (that is, adverbial phrase), the subject can no longer stand first, it has to be thrown after the whole phrase, for the subject can not stand between the closely connected verb and adverb. It is because of the fact that verb and adverb are so closely connected, that in interrogative sentences we have inversion of the subject. To illustrate: the oldest type of the interrogative sentence is: *Aeschines ubi est?* Now as time went on the interrogative word became fixed at the beginning of the sentence and, since verb and adverb were so closely connected, the subject had to go after them both, thus *Aeschines ubi est?* became *ubi est Aeschines?* Dr. Richter then gives the chronology of the interrogative sentence as follows:

1. Proposition in an interrogative tone.
2. Proposition with interrogative word in position that would be occupied by the word to which it refers. For example, *Aeschines ubi est?*
3. Interrogative sentence with advancement of the interrogative word.
4. All interrogative sentences now become analogically built on this model.

It is this same close connection, says Dr. Richter, that explains the inversion after certain conjunctions. In a word, it is because of their adverbial nature. In other words, the adverbial conjunction requires inversion, the pure conjunction does not. This is illustrated by copious examples which can not be given in this brief summary.

Finally, we learn that Dr. Richter is of the opinion that the falling away of case-flection did not cause a fixed word-position, but that the fixing of the word-position brought about the fall of case-flection.

I have given above an exceedingly condensed summary of Dr. Richter's work. The treatise is worthy of note in that it furnishes the first general discussion of the development of the Romance word-order out of the Latin, and because of the investigation (in chapters IV and V) of certain individual constructions. The theory, however, that is here advanced is of very little value and will be accepted by few indeed.

A discussion of the development of eight languages out of the mother tongue must be of a somewhat general nature, still more general must

such a work become when limited to one hundred and fifty-seven pages. Hence much interesting material has been omitted by Dr. Richter on the ground that only characteristics common to all the Romance Languages may here be considered. I allude to the investigation of such constructions as the relative position of adjective and substantive. Again, the psychological nature of such a work offers additional difficulties. But taking into account the general and psychological nature of the subject, I think that the work could have been much improved by a more conscious effort for clearness. However, a special consideration of the form is useless when the entire theory seems at fault. Dr. Richter informs us that neither subject nor verb is the most important member of the sentence, it is the Remainder that is important inasmuch as it contains the Dominating Idea. Hence, the shift of the verb from last to second place is because of a desire to prepare the way for this important Remainder. The position of the verb in the second place, after the subject and before the limiting Remainder is in accordance with the laws of logic ; why then is it necessary to go so far afield? Does not Dr. Richter occupy a rôle similar to that of the Classical Philologist who collected so many examples and wrote so learnedly to show why *refert* should always be used instead of *interest* in the Dactylic Hexameter?

The work, however, is very suggestive, especially in the fourth and fifth chapters, and will doubtless be followed by more detailed discussion.

DOUGLAS L. BUFFUM.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

---

### PROVENÇAL LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE. III.

3. *Über die provenzalischen Feliber und ihre Vorgänger.* Rede bei der Übernahme des Rektorats gehalten in der Aula der Universität Greifswald am 11. Mai 1894 von EDUARD KOSCHWITZ. Berlin, Gronau, 1894. 8vo., pp. 38.
4. *Frederi Mistral, der Dichter der Provence.*

Von NICOLAUS WELTER. Mit Mistral's Bildnis. Marburg, Elwert, 1899. 8vo., pp. 356. Price : 4 marks (bound, 5 marks).

5. *Theodor Aubanel, ein provenzalischer Sänger der Schönheit.* Von NIKOLAUS WELTER. Mit Aubanel's Bildnis. Marburg, Elwert, 1902. 8vo., pp. 223. Price : 3 marks (bound, 4 marks).
6. *Chrestomathie Provençale (x<sup>e</sup>-xv<sup>e</sup> siècles) par KARL BARTSCH.* Sixième édition entièrement refondue par EDUARD KOSCHWITZ. I. Textes. Marburg, Elwert, 1903. 8vo., pp. 224 = col. 448. [Le glossaire paraîtra dans le courant de cette année et sera fourni sans frais comme supplément.]

3. The address which Professor Koschwitz delivered in the "Aula" before members and friends of the University of Greifswald, when he had been duly elected "rector magnificus" or president of this university for the year 1894, contains a very good *résumé* of the history of the *Félibres* and their precursors. It has been published in the shape of a pamphlet with numerous notes, giving us those valuable *Quellenangaben*, or indications of sources, which the student is pleased to find in every book or paper written by a German scholar.

The pamphlet has about the same contents as Koschwitz's introduction to his edition of *Mirèio*. But I like it much better, and I think it deserves being brought up to date in a second edition. The writer, using his native language and his customary style, freely expresses his own personal opinions and naturally follows his French authorities with perfect freedom and independence.

Prof. Koschwitz examines at some length, in his pamphlet, also the social and political aspect of the *Félibrige* movement, which is so closely connected with the general tendency towards decentralization in France. An ardent local patriotism, fostered and kept awake by the *Félibres*, in the South, causes learned and literary societies to be founded for the study of the native dialects and of the Provençal literature, magnificent university buildings to be erected, faculties to be endowed with rich means, and new chairs to be created, in old provincial towns which, in former times, used to look sleepy and appeared entirely unprogressive